UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,175	03/25/2004	Denilson Nastacio	5577-292 RSW920040017US1	6802

53792 7590 05/14/2008

DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.
SUITE 2110
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER	
LINDSEY, MATTHEW S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,175	NASTACIO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MATTHEW S. LINDSEY	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,8,10-12,14-16,18-21,23-25 and 28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25, 28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-19, 21, 23-25, and 28-30 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 6-7, 9, 13, 17, 20, 22, 26, and 27 have been canceled as filed on 3/20/2008. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 15-16, 18-19, 21, 23-25, and 28-30 have been amended as filed on 3/20/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-19, 21, 23-25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marwaha (US 2003/0200486), hereinafter Marwaha, in view of Natarajan et al. (US 6,584,502 B1), hereinafter Natarajan.

4. With respect to Claim 1, Marwaha discloses: "A method of generating events having a common event format (Page 14, Paragraph [0011], lines 1-4), comprising: associating a content handler with the event factory (Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c, and [0030], lines 7-9, the table below this and Paragraph [0031], lines 1-2, where a

content handler is the CEF translator and the event factory is the Listener/Receiver); obtaining a common base event associated with the content handler ([0028], lines 1-5, Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c); populating the common base event with source specific situation information to provide a populated base event ([0026], line 5, "object", defined later to be "To identify the affected component", Page 15, 1st Col., under the Object heading); determining if a format of the populated common base event conforms to a predefined event format ([0025], lines 8-11, where during data normalization the event format may be updated, shown by [0027], lines 1-3, the data normalization phase determines if the format is acceptable, and if not updates the format, see Pg 14, the table below [0027], specifically "OriginDateTime", Remarks "If the original date/time is present, then that may be used"), wherein the predefined event format is defined by the content handler ([0025], lines 8-11, where the data normalization transformer gathers the predefined information such as source, type, and status); and generating a common event format representation of the populated base event based on the predefined event format if the format of the populated base event does not conform to the predefined event format ([0027], lines 1-3)".

Marwaha does not disclose: "associating an event factory with a directory service; locating the event factory using the directory service" or "returning the populated base event incorporated in the content handler from the event factory to the event source".

However, Natarajan discloses: "associating an event factory with a directory service (Col. 26, lines 6-10); locating the event factory using the directory service (Col.

26, lines 6-10)" or "returning the populated base event incorporated in the content handler from the event factory to the event source (Col. 7, lines 27-30, where the event information was reported to a policy engine, updated, and is sent back to selected network elements)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan to include using a directory service to locate the event factory. Motivation to combine these references comes from the function of a directory service itself. Directory services are provided to store and organize information regarding a network, such as mapping network addresses to names of their respective network devices, relieving users from using unfriendly network addresses. Combining the event notification of Marwaha with the location of the event factory using a directory service of Natarajan therefore creates a more user friendly experience by allowing the user to specify a name rather than a network address.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan to include sending the information back to the source. Motivation comes from Natarajan, "The updated control information is fed back to selected network elements to thereby affect operation of the selected elements" (Abstract, lines 9-11). By combining the event notification of Marwaha with sending information back to the source of Natarajan, the event notification system can affect operation of the elements based on event notification data.

5. With respect to Claim 12, Marwaha discloses: "A system for generating events having a common event format ([0011], lines 1-4), comprising: an event factory module configured to generate instances of a common base event object (Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c, [0030], lines 7-9, the table below this and [0031], lines 1-2); an event source configured to obtain an instance of the common base event object ([0025], lines 3-4, Figure 2 shows the listener/receiver, 202, which listens for incoming events) and populate the common base event object with source specific situation information to provide a populated base event object ([0026], line 5, "object", defined later to be "To identify the affected component", Page 15, 1st Col., under the Object heading), the instance of the common base event object incorporating a content handler module ([0028], lines 1-5, Figure 3, objects 304a, b, and c); and an event emitter module configured to utilize the content handler module of the populated common base event object to generate a common event format representation of the populated common base event object ([0036], lines 1-2 and the following table) and provide the common event format representation of the populated common base event object to an event server ([0037], lines 1-2, the PEM being described in [0038] as "PATROL Enterprise Manager … PATROL resides on individual hosts and monitors different parameters for exceptions, and generates alert information which PEM may gather")", and "and wherein the event factory module is further configured to associate the content handler module with the event factory module (Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c, Page 15, Paragraph [0030], lines 7-9, the table below this and Paragraph [0031], lines 1-2)".

Marwaha does not disclose: "wherein the event source is further configured to locate the event factory module using a directory service", or "and return the populated base event object incorporated in the associated content handler module to the event source".

However Natarajan discloses: "wherein the event source is further configured to locate the event factory module using a directory service (Col. 26, lines 6-10), and return the populated base event object incorporated in the associated content handler module to the event source (Col. 7, lines 27-30, where the event information was reported to a policy engine, updated, and is sent back to selected network elements)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan to include using a directory service to locate the event factory. Motivation to combine these references comes from the function of a directory service itself. Directory services are provided to store and organize information regarding a network, such as mapping network addresses to names of their respective network devices, relieving users from using unfriendly network addresses. Combining the event notification of Marwaha with the location of the event factory using a directory service of Natarajan therefore creates a more user friendly experience by allowing the user to specify a name rather than a network address.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan

to include sending the information back to the source. Motivation comes from Natarajan, "The updated control information is fed back to selected network elements to thereby affect operation of the selected elements" (Abstract, lines 9-11). By combining the event notification of Marwaha with sending information back to the source of Natarajan, the event notification system can affect operation of the elements based on event notification data.

6. With respect to Claim 21, Marwaha discloses: "A computer program product for generating events having a common event format (Page 14, Paragraph [0011], lines 1-4), comprising: a computer readable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied therein, the computer readable program code comprising: computer readable program code configured to associate a content handler with the event factory (Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c, and [0030], lines 7-9, the table below this and Paragraph [0031], lines 1-2, where a content handler is the CEF translator and the event factory is the Listener/Receiver); computer readable program code configured to obtain a common base event associated with the content handler ([0028], lines 1-5, Figure 3, objects 304a, b and c); computer readable program code configured to populate the common base event with source specific situation information to provide a populated base event ([0026], line 5, "object", defined later to be "To identify the affected component", Page 15, 1st Col., under the Object heading); computer readable program code configured to determine if a format of the populated common base event conforms to a predefined event format ([0025], lines 8-11, where during data

normalization the event format may be updated, shown by [0027], lines 1-3, the data normalization phase determines if the format is acceptable, and if not updates the format, see Pg 14, the table below [0027], specifically "OriginDateTime", Remarks "If the original date/time is present, then that may be used"), wherein the predefined event format is defined by the content handler ([0025], lines 8-11, where the data normalization transformer gathers the predefined information such as source, type, and status); and computer readable program code configured to generate a common event format representation of the populated base event based on the predefined event format if the format of the populated base event does not conform to the predefined event format ([0027], lines 1-3)".

Marwaha does not disclose: "computer readable program code configured to associate an event factory with a directory service; computer readable program code configured to locate the event factory using the directory service", or "computer readable program code configured to return the common base event incorporated in the associated content handler from the event factory to the event source"

However, Natarajan discloses: "computer readable program code configured to associate an event factory with a directory service (Col. 26, lines 6-10); computer readable program code configured to locate the event factory using the directory service (Col. 26, lines 6-10)", or "computer readable program code configured to return the common base event incorporated in the associated content handler from the event factory to the event source (Col. 7, lines 27-30, where the event information was reported to a policy engine, updated, and is sent back to selected network elements)".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan to include using a directory service to locate the event factory. Motivation to combine these references comes from the function of a directory service itself. Directory services are provided to store and organize information regarding a network, such as mapping network addresses to names of their respective network devices, relieving users from using unfriendly network addresses. Combining the event notification of Marwaha with the location of the event factory using a directory service of Natarajan therefore creates a more user friendly experience by allowing the user to specify a name rather than a network address.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the event notification of Marwaha with the teachings of Natarajan to include sending the information back to the source. Motivation comes from Natarajan, "The updated control information is fed back to selected network elements to thereby affect operation of the selected elements" (Abstract, lines 9-11). By combining the event notification of Marwaha with sending information back to the source of Natarajan, the event notification system can affect operation of the elements based on event notification data.

7. With respect to Claims 3 and 23, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "wherein the source specific situation information is provided in a plurality of event fields (Marwaha, [0026], lines 2-7) and wherein generating a common event

format representation of the populated base event comprises: determining if ones of the plurality of event fields conform to the predefined event format defined by the content handler (Marwaha, [0017], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated", if the value are to be updated, they are checked against some standard, see [0030], lines 1-5); modifying the format of the ones of the plurality of event fields that do not conform to the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0017], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated"); determining if ones of the plurality of event fields are empty (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated or assigned values", assigning a value implies the value was not present during an inspection stage); and populating the empty ones of the plurality of event fields with source specific situation information based on the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated or assigned values")".

8. With respect to Claims 4 and 24, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "further comprising: providing the common event format representation of the populated base event to an event server (Marwaha, [0037], lines 1-2); and storing the common event format representation of the populated base event in a data store at the event server (Marwaha, [0038], lines 1-3)".

9. With respect to Claims 5 and 25, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "further comprising: querying the event server to obtain status information of a system associated with the event source based on the stored common event format representation of the populated base event (Marwaha, [0045], lines 10-13)".

10. With respect to Claims 8 and 18, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "wherein the directory service comprises a Java Naming and Directory(JNDI) service (Natarajan, Col. 26, lines 6-10)".

11. With respect to Claims 10 and 29, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "wherein the populated base event comprises a date and/or time stamp (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "OriginDateTime", further defined below as "The date/time that the event occurred at the origin" Page 14, 2nd Col., under the OriginDateTime heading), a situation type (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "ObjectClass", further defined below as "The category to which the object belongs" Page 15, 1st Col. Under the heading "ObjectClass"), an identity of the event source and/or an identity of a component reporting the situation type (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "Object", further defined below as "The affected component for which the event was generated" Page 15, 1st Col. Under the heading "Object")".

12. With respect to Claims 11 and 30, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "wherein generating comprises automatically generating a common event

format representation of the populated base event based on the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3)".

13. With respect to Claim 14, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "The system of Claim 12, wherein the source specific situation information is provided in a plurality of event fields (Marwaha, [0026], lines 2-7) and wherein the content handler module is further configured to: determine if ones of the plurality of event fields conform to a predefined event format defined by the content handler module (Marwaha, [0017], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated", if the value are to be updated, they are checked against some standard, see [0030], lines 1-5); modify the format of the ones of the plurality of event fields that do not conform to the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0017], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated"); determine if ones of the plurality of event fields are empty (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated or assigned values", assigning a value implies the value was not present during an inspection stage); and populate the empty ones of the plurality of event fields with source specific situation information based on the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3, "The following tables show examples of tokens and their values that may be updated or assigned values")".

14. With respect to Claim 15, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "The system of Claim 12, wherein the event server is further configured to store the common event format representation of the populated base event object in a data store at the event server (Marwaha, [0038], lines 1-3)".

15. With respect to Claim 16, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "The system of Claim 15, further comprising a consumer module (Marwaha, Figure 3, object 314) configured to query the event server to obtain status information of the system based on the stored common event format representation of the populated base event object (Marwaha, [0042], lines 1-6)".

16. With respect to Claim 19, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "The system of Claim 12, wherein the populated base object comprises a date and/or time stamp (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "OriginDateTime", further defined below as "The date/time that the event occurred at the origin" Page 14, 2nd Col., under the OriginDateTime heading), a situation type (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "ObjectClass", further defined below as "The category to which the object belongs" Page 15, 1st Col. Under the heading "ObjectClass"), an identity of the event source and/or an identity of a component reporting the situation type (Marwaha, [0026], lines 3-7, the "Object", further defined below as "The affected component for which the event was generated" Page 15, 1st Col. Under the heading "Object")".

17. With respect to Claim 28, the combination of Marwaha and Natarajan disclose: "The computer program product of Claim 21, further comprising computer readable program code configured to request that the content handler modify the populated base event based on the predefined event format (Marwaha, [0027], lines 1-3)".

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments, see pg 11, lines 11-12, filed 3/20/2008, with respect to the drawing objections have been fully considered and are persuasive. The objection of the drawings has been withdrawn.

19. Applicant argues on page 11, lines 16-20, filed 3/20/2008, "Marwaha merely discloses converting a received event to a common event format, irrespective of a format of the received event", and that "applicants claimed subject matter only converts a received event to a common event format when the received event is not already in the common event format" have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Marwaha discloses: "The following tables show examples of the tokens and their values that may be updated" ([0027], lines 1-2), and see the table below [0027], OriginDateTime, Remarks, "If the original date/time is present, then that may be used". Therefore, the process of normalization includes determining whether the format is already acceptable. If the format is acceptable, the system uses that value, if the format is not acceptable the normalization phase will update the value.

20. Applicant argues on page 11, lines 21-22, filed 3/20/2008, "Marwaha does not teach or suggest a method that includes an event source that accesses an event factory to obtain a common base event that is populated" have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Marwaha discloses: "At 202, a listener or receiver listens (event source) for incoming alerts (from an event factory)… In data enrichment phase, a transformer 206, for example, additional data associated with the message. These additional data added during data enrichment phase (data added forms a common base event that is populated)" ([0025], lines 3-14).

21. Applicant argues on page 11, lines 22-24, and lines 26-29, and on pg 12, lines 4-7, filed 3/20/2008, Marwaha does not teach or suggest a common base event is "returned to the event source (in the form of a populated based event incorporated in a content handler)" have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Natarajan. Natarajan discloses: "The information which is reported to the data store 252 is analyzed by a policy engine 254. The policy engine 254 includes a plurality of application specific plug-in policies for analyzing application specific information from the data store and for computing updated control information based upon the analysis of the information (in the form of a populated based event, updated control information, incorporated in a content handler, policy engine). The updated control information may include any type of information, parameters, and/or

actions which may be used to affect the operation of one or more network elements. The updated control information is then fed back to selected network elements (returned to the event source) to thereby affect operation of the selected elements and/or network" (Col. 7, lines 19-29).

22. Applicant argues on page 12, lines 7-9, filed 3/20/2008, "Natarajan, while being directed to a network that employs events and directory services, is not directed to a network that converts events to a common event format" have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Natarajan was used in conjunction with Marwaha to form a 103 obvious rejection, Marwaha discloses a network that converts events to a common event format ([0011], lines 1-4).

23. Applicant argues on page 12, lines 10-13, filed 3/20/2008, Natarajan "does not teach or suggest a method or computer readable program code (system) that includes an event source that accesses an event factory (module) to obtain a common base event (object) that is populated and returned to the event source (in the form of a populated based event incorporated in a content handler (module))" have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made from Marwaha in view of Natarajan. Marwaha discloses: "At 202, a listener or receiver listens (event source) for incoming alerts (from an event factory)… In data enrichment phase, a transformer 206, for example, assitional data associated with the message.

These additional data added during data enrichment phase (data added forms a common base event that is populated)" ([0025], lines 3-14). Natarajan discloses: "The information which is reported to the data store 252 is analyzed by a policy engine 254. The policy engine 254 includes a plurality of application specific plug-in policies for analyzing application specific information from the data store and for computing updated control information based upon the analysis of the information (in the form of a populated based event, or updated control information, incorporated in a content handler, or policy engine). The updated control information may include any type of information, parameters, and/or actions which may be used to affect the operation of one or more network elements. The updated control information is then fed back to selected network elements (returned to the event source) to thereby affect operation of the selected elements and/or network" (Col. 7, lines 19-29).

Conclusion

24. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW S. LINDSEY whose telephone number is (571)270-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30-5, Fridays 7:30-1.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MSL
5/8/2008

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151